

Miles N. Clark, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 13848  
Matthew I. Knepper, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 12796  
KNEPPER & CLARK LLC  
5510 So. Fort Apache Rd, Suite 30  
Las Vegas, NV 89148  
Phone: (702) 856-7430  
Fax: (702) 447-8048  
Email: Miles.Clark@knepperclark.com

Michael F. Ram (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Marie N. Appel (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
MORGAN & MORGAN COMPLEX  
LITIGATION GROUP  
711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500 San  
Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 358-6913  
Facsimile: (415) 358-6293  
Email: MRam@forthepeople.com  
Email: MAppel@forthepeople.com

Benjamin R. Osborn (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
102 Bergen Street Brooklyn, NY 11201  
Telephone: (347) 645-0464  
Email: Ben@benosbornlaw.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed  
Class*

COHEN-JOHNSON, LLC  
H. Stan Johnson, Esq. (SBN: 0265)  
(sjohnson@cohenjohnson.com)  
375 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 104  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119  
Telephone: (702) 823-3500  
Facsimile: (702) 823-3400

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
Shon Morgan (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
(shonmorgan@quinnemanuel.com)  
John W. Baumann (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
(jackbaumann@quinnemanuel.com)  
865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Cristina Henriquez (Bar No. 317445)  
(cristinahenriquez@quinnemanuel.com)  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, California 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5000

Attorneys for ANCESTRY.COM  
OPERATIONS INC., ANCESTRY.COM  
INC., and ANCESTRY.COM LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ANTHONY SESSA and MARK SESSA, *on  
behalf of themselves and all others similarly  
situated,*

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANCESTRY.COM OPERATIONS INC., a  
Virginia Corporation; ANCESTRY.COM  
INC., a Delaware Corporation; and  
ANCESTRY.COM LLC, a Delaware Limited  
Liability Company,  
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:20-cv-02292-GMN-BNW

**JOINT DISCOVERY PLAN AND  
PROPOSED ORDER**

Complaint filed: Dec. 17, 2020

1 The parties to the above-entitled action jointly submit this JOINT DISCOVERY PLAN &  
2 PROPOSED ORDER pursuant to Civil Local Rule 26-1.

3 **1. Discovery Cut-Off Date.**

4 Plaintiffs' Position: Ancestry filed an anti-SLAPP motion to strike on February 10, 2021  
5 (Dkt. No. 19). Plaintiffs believe the motion is baseless. A similar anti-SLAPP motion by Ancestry  
6 was denied in a related California case. *Callahan v. Ancestry.com Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-08437-LB,  
7 2021 WL 783524, at \*11 (N.D. Cal., Mar. 1, 2021). However, because an anti-SLAPP motion  
8 triggers an automatic stay of discovery on topics unrelated to the anti-SLAPP motion itself,  
9 Plaintiffs cannot yet commence discovery. Plaintiffs anticipate completing discovery within 12  
10 months of the entry of a dispositive ruling on the anti-SLAPP motion.

11 Ancestry Position: As set forth in Ancestry's motion to dismiss and strike, Ancestry disputes  
12 the Court's subject-matter jurisdiction based on plaintiffs' lack of Article III standing and also disputes  
13 personal jurisdiction over Ancestry. *See* ECF No. 19. In addition, Ancestry's filing of the motion to  
14 strike pursuant to Nevada's anti-SLAPP statute automatically stays discovery pending resolution  
15 of the motion. Nev. Rev. Stat. § 41.660(3)(e); *See also Foley v. Pont*, No. 2:11-CV-01769-ECR,  
16 2012 WL 2503074, at \*5 (D. Nev. June 27, 2012) ("staying discovery pending the outcome of the  
17 [] Defendants' antiSLAPP motion to dismiss is warranted under NRS 41.660(3)."). Accordingly,  
18 it is Ancestry's position that it is premature to engage in discovery or to try to establish a schedule  
19 for discovery. This is especially true in light of the automatic right to appeal the denial of an anti-  
20 SLAPP motion, which appeal would result in an automatic stay of the district court proceedings  
21 (including discovery) until the appeal is resolved.

22 As described more fully in Ancestry's motion to dismiss, this case is one of three virtually  
23 identical, class actions in different federal courts that plaintiffs' counsel have filed. The first has  
24 already been dismissed for reasons that apply equally here. *See Callahan v. Ancestry.com*, Case  
25  
26  
27  
28

No. 20-cv-08437-LB, 2021 WL 783524, \*4-6 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2021). A motion to dismiss in the second action will be fully briefed by the end of the month. *See Bonilla v. Ancestry.com*, Case No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.).

## 2. Amending the Pleadings and Adding Parties, Expert Disclosures, Dispositive Motions, and Pretrial Order.

Because of Ancestry's pending anti-SLAPP motion, the parties are unable to estimate a specific date for close of discovery. For the same reason, they are not yet able to provide dates for the various deadlines that are measured by reference to the close of discovery. Should this case proceed past the pleadings, Ancestry (1) anticipates filing a motion for summary judgment and a motion to deny class certification, and (2) may engage experts, including with respect to potential class certification issues.

## 3. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a) Disclosures

Plaintiffs' Position: Ancestry has taken the position it is not obligated to provide Rule 26(a) disclosures while the anti-SLAPP motion is pending. Plaintiffs are prepared to exchange Rule 26(a) disclosures at any time.

Ancestry Position: Ancestry objects to the initial disclosure requirement set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Ancestry has filed a motion to strike plaintiffs' complaint pursuant to Nevada's anti-SLAPP statute. Accordingly, discovery is automatically stayed pending resolution of the motion and the disposition of any appeal from the ruling on the motion. Nev. Rev. Stat. § 41.660(3)(e); *Foley v. Pont*, No. 2:11-CV-01769-ECR, 2012 WL 2503074, at \*5 (D. Nev. June 27, 2012) ("staying discovery pending the outcome of the [] Defendants' anti-SLAPP motion to dismiss is warranted under NRS 41.660(3).").

## 4. Alternative Dispute Resolution

The parties have conferred and agree any mediation would be most productive following resolution of Ancestry's pending motion to dismiss and anti-SLAPP motion to strike. If this case

survives the pending motion to dismiss and strike, the parties also agree, subject to approval from the Court, to participate in private mediation.

### 5. Alternative Forms of Case Disposition

The parties certify that they considered trial by magistrate judge and use of the Short Trial Program. The parties agree that neither are appropriate for this matter.

### 6. Electronic Evidence

Discovery has not yet begun as resolution of Ancestry's anti-SLAPP motion is pending. Thus, the parties have not yet discussed whether they intend to present evidence in electronic format to jurors.

Respectfully submitted,

<b>KNEPPER &amp; CLARK LLC</b>	<b>COHEN-JOHNSON, LLC</b>
<i>/s/ Miles N. Clark</i>	<i>/s/ H. Stan Johnson</i>
Matthew I. Knepper, Esq., SBN 12796 Miles N. Clark, Esq., SBN 13848 Shaina R. Plaksin, Esq., SBN 13935 5510 So. Fort Apache Rd, Suite 30 Las Vegas, NV 89148 Email: matthew.knepper@knepperclark.com Email: miles.clark@knepperclark.com Email: shaina.plaksin@knepperclark.com	H. Stan Johnson, Esq., SBN 0265 375 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 104 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119 Email: sjohnson@cohenjohnson.com  <b>Attorneys for Defendants Ancestry.com Operations Inc., Ancestry.com Inc., and Ancestry.com LLC</b>
<i>Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class</i>	

**ORDER**

The Court will construe ECF No. 29 as a stipulation to stay discovery pending a decision on ECF No. 19. The parties' stipulation is GRANTED. IT IS ORDERED that the parties must file a new proposed discovery plan and scheduling order within 14 days of a decision on ECF No. 19, unless the case is dismissed in its entirety without leave to amend.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

**DATED:** 4:05 pm, April 23, 2021



**BRENDA WEKSLER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**